

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on December 13, 2005, in which claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11-14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kryder et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,011,664) ("Kryder") in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art ("A.A.P.A.") and claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kryder as modified by A.A.P.A. and further in view of Pelhos et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2004/0115481).

Independent claims 1-20 have been canceled, and new claims 21-40 are now presented.

Independent Claim 21

Independent claim 21 recites "producing a current in a coil, wherein the current generates a magnetic write field and a high frequency magnetic field; and wherein the magnetic write field and the high frequency magnetic field create an area of magnetic resonance within the magnetic media.." Therefore, independent claim 21 describes a method of writing to a magnetic media that only requires a single current be provided to a single coil, that current generating a magnetic write field and a high frequency magnetic field that create an area of magnetic resonance within the magnetic media.

This is in contrast with Kryder, which teaches a system in which "a power supply 46 and a loop of wire 48 are used to establish a global static magnetic field . . . [and] a radio frequency generator 50 and a loop of wire 52 are used to establish a global radio frequency field . . ." (Col. 5, ll. 39-45). Therefore, Kryder requires the generation of two separate currents. The first current is provided to loop of wire 48 to generate the global static magnetic field and the second current is provided to loop of wire 52 to generate the global radio frequency field. This difference is explicitly shown in FIGS. 3 and 5 of Kryder. As shown in both FIGS. 3 and 5, Kryder requires an RF generator 50 and a DC power supply 46, wherein the DC power supply generates a first current in loop of wire 48 and RF generator 50 generates a second current in loop of wire 52. Therefore, Kryder does not teach producing a current in a coil, wherein the current generates a magnetic write field and a high frequency magnetic field.

Because Kryder does not teach each and every element of independent claim 21, the Applicant submits that independent claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 22-29

Dependent claims 22-29 depend from independent claim 21. As such, the claims are allowable with their independent base claim since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 22, 23, 25, 26, and 28 are substantially similar to canceled claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10, respectively, which were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent claim 30

Independent claim 30 recites "a coil adjacent the write pole having a current that includes a write current component and a high frequency component, wherein the write current component and the high frequency component are controlled to create an area of magnetic resonance within a magnetic media." Independent claim 30 clarifies that a single coil, having a current that includes a write current component and a high frequency component, is used to create an area of magnetic resonance within the magnetic media.

This is in contrast with Kryder, which teaches a system in which "a power supply 46 and a loop of wire 48 are used to establish a global static magnetic field . . . [and] a radio frequency generator 50 and a loop of wire 52 are used to establish a global radio frequency field . . ." (Col. 5, ll. 39-45). Therefore, Kryder teaches the use of two separate loops of wire or coils, the first loop of wire being used to establish the global static magnetic field and the second loop of wire being used to establish a global radio frequency field. Therefore, Kryder does not teach a single coil that has a current controlled to create

an area of magnetic resonance within a magnetic media.

For the reasons discussed above, independent claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 31-35

Dependent claims 31-35 depend from independent claim 30. As such, the claims are allowable with their independent base claim since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 31, 32 and 33 are substantially similar to canceled claims 15-17, respectively, which were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Independent Claim 36

Independent claim 36 recites “a coil adjacent the magnetic pole, the coil having a write current, and writing means for creating an area of magnetic resonance on a portion of the magnetic media, wherein the writing means introduces a high frequency signal to the write current.” Independent claim 1 therefore creates an area of magnetic resonance using a single coil, that coil having a write current that is introduced to a high frequency signal by the writing means.

This is in also in contrast with Kryder, which, as stated above, requires the use of two separate coils or loop of wires. See Col. 5, ll. 39-45 (a power supply 46 and a loop of wire 48 are used to establish a global static magnetic field . . . [and] a radio frequency generator 50 and a loop of wire 52 are used to establish a global radio frequency field). Because Kryder does not teach the use of a single coil, but two separate coils, Kryder does not teach each and every element of independent claim 36.

For the reasons discussed above, independent claim 30 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 37-40

Dependent claims 37-40 depend from independent claim 36. As such, the claims are allowable with their independent base claim since any claim depending from a patentable independent claim is also patentable. See M.P.E.P. 2143.03, citing In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims 21-40 are in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 4/13/06

By: 

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

MAC: